

REMARKS**In the Specification:**

Applicants have amended paragraphs 0015 and 0016 of the specification to correct typographical errors.

In the Claims:**Claim 14 is Allowable**

The Office has objected to claim 14 at paragraph 1 of the Office Action, for typographical errors. Applicants have corrected the typographical errors, and submit that claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-18, at paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,819,746 (“Schneider”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

None of the cited references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, Schneider does not disclose retrieving a plurality of line profiles from a profile database, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Schneider discloses an expert system that learns from a database of information characterizing loops providing xDSL service and performance information. The expert system correlates in-service loop characteristic data to performance data to develop predictive statements, from which it can predict a level of performance for a new loop, but Schneider does not disclose retrieving line profiles from a profile database. See Schneider, col. 4, lines 1-15. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 and 5-9 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Schneider fails to disclose at least one element of each of claims 2-3 and 5-9. Accordingly, claims 2-3 and 5-9 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest reporting stored data using a remote internet browser reporting tool, as recited in claim 3. Instead, Schneider discloses an expert system that may be centralized, communicating with specific databases and expert systems in each central office to input request data and obtain predictive results, but Schneider does not disclose a remote internet browser reporting tool. *See* Schneider, col. 12, line 59-col 13, line 8. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 3. For at least this additional reason, claim 3 is allowable.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest that each of the set of DSL lines is associated with one of the plurality of line profiles before the step of measuring a performance parameter for each of the set of DSL lines, as recited in claim 5. In contrast to claim 5, Schneider discloses an expert system for qualifying DSL lines that uses several types of data including line lengths, gauges, and bridged taps, but Schneider does not disclose line profiles associated with each DSL line. *See* Schneider, col. 6, line 67-col 7, line 8. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 5. For at least this additional reason, claim 5 is allowable.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest that at least some of the plurality of line profiles associated with the set of DSL lines are the same line profiles that are applied to each of the physical DSL lines, as recited in claim 6. Instead, Schneider discloses an expert system for qualifying DSL lines that uses several types of data including line lengths, gauges, and bridged taps, but Schneider does not disclose line profiles associated with each DSL line. *See* Schneider, col. 6, line 67-col 7, line 8. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 6. For at least this additional reason, claim 6 is allowable.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest that at least one of the plurality of line profiles is an interleaved channel profile, as recited in claim 8, or that a second of the plurality of line profiles is a reduced speed profile, as recited in claim 9. Instead, Schneider discloses an expert system for qualifying DSL lines that uses several types of data

including line lengths, gauges, and bridged taps, but Schneider does not disclose line profiles. *See* Schneider, col. 6, line 67-col 7, line 8. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claims 8 or 9. For at least these additional reasons, claims 8 and 9 are allowable.

None of the cited references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 10. For example, Schneider fails to disclose or suggest a line profile database configured to provide a plurality of line profiles in response to a request from a computer system, as recited in claim 10. In contrast to claim 10, Schneider discloses a database of information characterizing loops providing xDSL service and information regarding the performance of those loops. *See* Schneider, col. 4, lines 1-3. Further, Schneider fails to disclose or suggest a digital subscriber line access multiplexer (DSLAM) configured to apply a line profile selected from a plurality of line profiles to a first physical DSL line, as recited in claim 10. Instead, Schneider discloses a loop qualification technique that qualifies loops to provide three different levels of service or indicates that loops will not support any of the available xDSL services. *See* Schneider, col. 11, lines 17-21. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is allowable.

Claims 11-15 and 17-18 depend from claim 10, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Schneider fails to disclose at least one element of each of claims 11-15 and 17-18. Accordingly, claims 11-15 and 17-18 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest that DSL performance data includes a first set of data captured before application of a line profile and a second set of data captured after application of the line profile, as recited in claim 13. Instead, Schneider discloses that the expert system uses performance data related to throughput or some other quality of service metric, and line characteristic data such as lengths, gauges, binder groups, and bridged taps. *See* Schneider, col. 6, line 63 – col. 7, line 19. Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 13. For at least this additional reason, claim 13 is allowable.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest that at least one of the plurality of line profiles is an interleaved channel profile, as recited in claim 14, or that each of a set of DSL lines is associated with one of a plurality of line profiles, as recited in claim 17, or that at least some of the plurality of line profiles associated with the set of DSL lines are the same line profiles that are applied to each of the physical DSL lines, as recited in claim 18. Instead, Schneider discloses a database of information characterizing loops providing xDSL service, and information regarding the performance of those loops. *See Schneider, col. 4, lines 1-3.* Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claims 14, 17, and 18. For at least this additional reason, claims 14, 17 and 18 are allowable.

Further, none of the references, including Schneider, disclose or suggest a display terminal to report stored performance data using a remote internet browser reporting tool, as recited in claim 15. Instead, Schneider discloses an expert system that may be centralized, communicating with specific databases and expert systems in each central office to input request data and obtain predictive results, but Schneider does not disclose a remote internet browser reporting tool. *See Schneider, col. 12, line 59-col 13, line 8.* Further, the Office has failed to demonstrate a motivation to modify the cited reference as in claim 15. For at least this additional reason, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 4 and 16 are Allowable

The Office has objected to claims 4 and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 4 depends from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Claim 16 depends from claim 10, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 4 and 16 are allowable.

Claims 19-23 are Allowable

Claims 19-23 have been added, and recite elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, claims 19-23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

4-25-2007
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)

JGT/SIE